

Solutions of Two Dimensional Viscous Accretion and Winds In Kerr Black Hole Geometry¹

Sandip K. Chakrabarti

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay 400005, India;

e-mail: chakraba@tifrc2.tifr.res.in

ABSTRACT

We extend our previous studies of shock waves and shock-free solutions in thin accretion and winds in pseudo-Newtonian geometry to the case when the flow is *two-dimensional* and around a *Kerr black hole*. We present equations for fully general relativistic viscous transonic flows and classify the parameter space according to whether or not shocks form in an inviscid flow. We discuss the behaviors of shear, angular momentum distribution, heating and cooling in viscous flows. We obtain a very significant result: we find that in weak viscosity limit the presence of the standing shock waves is more generic in the sense that flows away from the equatorial plane can produce shock waves in a wider range of parameter space. Similar conclusion also holds when the angular momentum of the black hole is increased. Generally, our conclusions regarding the shape of the shock waves are found to agree with results of the existing numerical simulations of the two dimensional accretion in Schwarzschild geometry. In a strong viscosity limit, the shocks may be located farther out or disappear completely as in the pseudo-Newtonian geometry.

Subject headings: Accretion, Accretion Disks - Black Hole Physics - Hydrodynamics - - Shock Waves - Winds

Appearing in Astrophysical Journal On Nov. 1st, 1996

¹Submitted to the Astrophysical Journal

1. INTRODUCTION

The recognition that the accretion process onto compact objects are inherently three-dimensional is as old as the subject of accretion itself. The pioneering work of Bondi (1952), however, contained the solution for spherically symmetric inflow, thereby reducing the problem in one dimension. Subsequently, Lynden-Bell (1978) considered the flow to have a constant angular momentum but without any radial velocity. He considered the axisymmetric case, so that the problem is two dimensional, but still integrable because of the choice of negligible radial motion. This study was later extended to understand thick accretion flow structures in pseudo-Newtonian geometry (e.g., Paczyński & Wiita, 1980) as well as in full general relativity (Chakrabarti 1985, hereafter C85 and references therein) using more general power law distribution of angular momentum which mimicked a viscous rotating flow.

Nonetheless, major progress on the theoretical front has been done mostly for accretion flows which are thin and confined close to the equatorial plane. The study of optically thick viscous Keplerian disks (Shakura & Sunyaev, 1973; Novikov & Thorne, 1973), and viscous transonic disks (Paczyński & Bisnovaty-Kogan, 1981; Chakrabarti, 1990, hereafter C90; for a general discussion, see, Chakrabarti 1996a, 1996b, hereafter C96b, and references therein) are some of the examples. Secondly, most of these studies are done using the so-called pseudo-Newtonian potential of Paczyński & Wiita (1980) which mimics the external geometry of Schwarzschild black hole quite well, although the computational error could be significant very close to the horizon since the inner boundary condition is not exactly satisfied. (see, Yang and Kafatos, 1995, for a discussion on isothermal disks in Schwarzschild geometry) Of interest to us in the context of the present paper is a significant observation from the study of the most general viscous transonic flow that in a large range of parameter space, spanned by the two free parameters, namely the specific energy and angular momentum, the flow develops standing shock waves close to a black hole (C90, C96b). Questions naturally arise: Do these shocks continue to be present when a full general relativistic study is made? If so, do the general dependences of shock behavior on flow parameters remain similar as in the pseudo-Newtonian treatment? Would these shock waves also form *away* from the equatorial plane when the flow is two dimensional? How would the shock locations change as one goes from a non-rotating black hole to a rotating black hole? In the present paper, we shall answer these questions. Recent works (Chakrabarti & Wiita, 1992; Chakrabarti & Titarchuk, 1995) indicate that shock waves could be a natural sites of the hot radiation in a black hole accretion, and that the observed quasi-periodic oscillations could be due to some type of resonance oscillation in the post-shock flow (Molteni, Sponholz & Chakrabarti, 1996) or due to dynamical oscillation of the sub-Keplerian flow (Ryu, Chakrabarti & Molteni, 1996). These make it all the more important to understand the behavior of shock waves in accretion and wind flows close to a black hole. Of course, a large region of the parameter space do not form shocks at all. We therefore classify the entire parameter space for a conical wedge shaped flow to show which regions form shock waves, and which regions do not. Another topic of importance which did not fetch adequate attention in the literature so far, (despite being very relevant for the self-consistent

treatment of a viscous transonic flow) is: how should one treat the inner edge of the flow near the horizon? Traditionally, shear is treated to be zero at the inner edge (at $r = r_{ms}$, the marginally stable orbit for a Shakura-Sunyaev [1973] disk) or on the horizon for pseudo-Newtonian viscous transonic flows (C90, C96b). Does shear indeed vanish on the horizon? If not, what effect, if any, would it have on the angular momentum distribution, or heating processes? We plan to answer these questions as well. The motivation is to build a general framework on which viscous transonic flows may be studied in future with full consistency when additional heating and cooling effects are introduced.

Numerical simulations of fully two dimensional accretion around a Schwarzschild black hole have already provided partial answers to some of the questions posed above. Hawley, Smarr & Wilson (1984, 1985, hereafter HSW84, HSW85; Hawley, 1984, hereafter H84) showed that quasi-spherical rotating flows develop traveling accretion shock waves whose shapes generally follow the funnel walls around the vertical axis. More recent works of Molteni, Lanzafame & Chakrabarti, 1994, hereafter MLC94; Ryu et al, 1995; Molteni, Ryu & Chakrabarti, 1996, hereafter MRC96) are examples of numerical simulations which produced *standing shock* waves in thin as well as thick accretion flows. The importance of these latter works is that the codes have been tested quite adequately against the corresponding analytical transonic solutions (which were non-existent during the simulations of HSW84, HSW85) for thin flows, and therefore the existence of standing shocks in thicker flows which they reveal may be trusted.

In the following sections, we shall try to solve the equations of viscous transonic flows in an axisymmetric, thick flow from a purely analytical point of view. To achieve our goal we make simplifying approximations. We also use fully general relativistic equations for the flow. Accreting matter in this case automatically fulfills the inner boundary condition on the horizon. We obtain solutions with and without shocks, both for accretion and winds. We arrive at several important conclusions regarding shock properties in a thick flow: (a) the region of flow parameters which enables shock formation is much bigger in a rotating black hole. However, the general behavior of the parameter space itself is similar to what is obtained in pseudo-Newtonian geometries (Chakrabarti 1989, hereafter C89; C90; Sponholz & Molteni, 1994) and (b) We find that the shock waves form away from the equatorial plane more easily because of weaker gravity. Since these shocks are centrifugally supported, a knowledge of the angular momentum distribution is important. We therefore also explore the nature of the shear stress which governs the transport of angular momentum. Viscosity not only transports angular momentum, it heats up the gas. Assuming the viscosity is due to ions only we compute the heating rate of the flow both in the subsonic and the supersonic branches. The cooling is governed by the density and temperature of the flow. We present the variation of the bremsstrahlung cooling rate along the flow as well, so that we may find out the relative importance of heating and cooling effects which might affect the flow properties.

The organization of the paper is as follows: In Section 2, we present the basic mathematical equations for the study of viscous, transonic flows in a black hole geometry. In Section 3, we

present a ‘brute force’ method to find the general behavior of the global surfaces, such as the funnel wall, centrifugal barrier, and the shock surfaces. In Section 4, we present the fully self-consistent solution of the steady flow which may or may not include shock waves. We then extend the result to a thicker flow. In Section 5, we summarize our work and make concluding remarks.

2. MODEL EQUATIONS

In what follows, we choose units of velocity, distance, and time to be c , GM_{bh}/c^2 and GM_{bh}/c^3 respectively, where G and M_{bh} are the gravitational constant and the mass of the black hole respectively. The matter distribution is assumed to be described by the stress-energy tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$ which for a perfect fluid takes the form,

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \rho u_\mu u_\nu + p(g_{\mu\nu} + u_\mu u_\nu), \quad (1)$$

which satisfies the equation of motion,

$$\nabla^\mu T_{\mu\nu} = 0, \quad (2)$$

Here, p is the isotropic thermal pressure and $\rho = \rho_0(1 + \pi)$ is the mass density, π being the internal energy. The four velocity components u_μ satisfy the normalization relation,

$$u_\mu u^\mu = -1 \quad (3)$$

where $\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$. We assume the metric around a Kerr black hole in Boyer-Lindquist coordinate (e.g., NT73),

$$ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu = -\frac{r^2 \Delta}{A} dt^2 + \frac{A}{r^2} (d\phi - \omega dt)^2 + \frac{r^2}{\Delta} dr^2 + dz^2 \quad (4)$$

Where,

$$A = r^4 + r^2 a^2 + 2ra^2$$

$$\Delta = r^2 - 2r + a^2$$

$$\omega = \frac{2ar}{A}$$

Here, $g_{\mu\nu}$ is the metric coefficient and u_μ is the four velocity components:

$$u_t = \left[\frac{\Delta}{(1 - V^2)(1 - \Omega l)(g_{\phi\phi} + l g_{t\phi})} \right]^{1/2}$$

and

$$u_\phi = -l u_t$$

where, the angular velocity is

$$\Omega = \frac{u^\phi}{u^t} = -\frac{g_{t\phi} + l g_{tt}}{g_{\phi\phi} + l g_{t\phi}}.$$

the l is the specific angular momentum. The radial velocity V in the rotating frame is

$$V = \frac{v}{(1 - \Omega l)^{1/2}}$$

where,

$$v = \left(-\frac{u_r u^r}{u_t u^t}\right)^{1/2}$$

Since by definition, $V = 1$ on the horizon and sound speed is expected to be less than unity even for the extreme equation of states, the black hole accretion has to be supersonic (and therefore sub-Keplerian) on the horizon. Thus, every flow *must deviate from a Keplerian disk* close to a black hole. The equation for the balance of the radial momentum is obtained from,

$$(u_\mu u_\nu + g_{\mu\nu})T_{;\nu}^{\mu\nu} = 0, \quad (5)$$

which is,

$$\vartheta \frac{d\vartheta}{dr} + \frac{1}{r\Delta} [a^2 - r + \frac{A\gamma^2 B}{r^3}] \vartheta^2 + \frac{A\gamma^2}{r^6} B + \left(\frac{\Delta}{r^2} + \vartheta^2\right) \frac{1}{p + \rho} \frac{dp}{dr} = 0 \quad (6)$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} \vartheta &= u^r, \\ \gamma^2 &= [1 - \frac{A^2}{\Delta r^4} (\Omega - \omega)]^{-1}, \\ B &= (\Omega a - 1)^2 - \Omega^2 r^3. \end{aligned}$$

Here and hereafter we use a comma to denote an ordinary derivative and a semi-colon to denote a co-variant derivative. The baryon number conservation equation (continuity equation) is obtained from

$$(\rho_0 u^\mu)_{;\mu} = 0,$$

which is,

$$\dot{M} = 2\pi r \vartheta \Sigma = 2\pi A \vartheta \rho_0 \quad (7)$$

where, A is the cross section area of the flow. The equation of the conservation of angular momentum is obtained from

$$(\delta_\phi^\mu T^{\mu\nu})_{;\nu} = 0$$

or,

$$\rho_0 u^\mu (h u_\phi)_{;\mu} = (\eta \sigma_\phi^\gamma)_{;\gamma} \quad (8)$$

where,

$$\eta = \nu \rho_0$$

is the coefficient of dynamical viscosity and ν is the coefficient of kinematic viscosity. When rotation is dominant the relevant shear tensor component σ_ϕ^r is given by (Anderson & Lemos, 1988; Straumann, 1991),

$$\sigma_\phi^r = -\frac{A^{3/2} \gamma^3 \Omega_{,r} \Delta^{1/2}}{2r^5} \quad (9)$$

so that the angular momentum equation takes the form,

$$\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{L}_+ = -\frac{1}{\vartheta r^5} \frac{d\Omega}{dr} \nu A^{3/2} \gamma^3 \Delta^{1/2}. \quad (10)$$

Where,

$$\mathcal{L} = -h u_\phi$$

and h is the specific enthalpy: $h = (p + \rho)/\rho_0$. Here we have modified earlier works of NT73 and Peitz (1994) in that the fluid angular momentum $\mathcal{L}$, rather than the particle angular momentum $-u_\phi$ is used. That way, for an inviscid flow ($\eta = 0$) one recovers $\mathcal{L} = \text{constant}$ as in a fluid picture. Similarly, the radial velocity term is included (eq. 6) and angular momentum is allowed to be non-Keplerian (Eq. 10). $\mathcal{L}_+$ is the angular momentum on the horizon since shear (as defined by Eq. 9) vanishes there. In presence of significant radial velocity, the shear in eq. (9) is to be replaced by its full expression,

$$\sigma^{\mu\nu} = (u_{;\beta}^\mu P^{\beta\nu} + u_{;\beta}^\nu P^{\beta\mu})/2 - \Theta P^{\mu\nu}/3$$

where $P^{\mu\nu} = g^{\mu\nu} + u^\mu u^\nu$ is the projection tensor and $\Theta = u_{;\mu}^\mu$ is the expansion (e.g., Shapiro & Teukolsky, 1983). In that case, $\mathcal{L}_+$ will no longer be the specific angular momentum of the flow at the horizon, but at the place where the residual shear effect vanishes. If, on the other hand, viscosity is allowed to vanish sufficient rapidly (as we assume in what follows) on the horizon, then it could be the angular momentum on the horizon as well.

Entropy generation equation is obtained from the first law of thermodynamics along with baryon conservation equation:

$$(S^\mu)_{;\mu} = Q^+ - Q^- = [2\eta\sigma_{\mu\nu}\sigma^{\mu\nu}]/T - Q^-, \quad (11)$$

which in expanded form, becomes,

$$\vartheta \Sigma \left(\frac{dh}{dr} - \frac{1}{\rho_0} \frac{dp}{dr} \right) = 2\nu \Sigma \sigma_{\mu\nu} \sigma^{\mu\nu} - Q^- \quad (12)$$

where Q^+ and Q^- are the heat generation rate (vertically integrated) and the heat loss rate respectively. h is the specific enthalpy: $h = (p + \rho)/\rho_0$. Here, we ignore the terms due to radiative transfer. Using rotational shear as given in eq. (9), the entropy equation takes the form,

$$\vartheta \Sigma \left(\frac{dh}{dr} - \frac{1}{\rho_0} \frac{dp}{dr} \right) = \frac{\nu \Sigma A^2 \gamma^4 (\Omega_{,r})^2}{r^6} - Q^- \quad (13)$$

Along with the equations given above, one needs to solve the relativistic shock conditions if the flow has a standing shock. A shock surface is a timelike three surface formally defined as,

$$\zeta(x^\mu) = 0 \quad (14)$$

across which some of the thermodynamic variables suffer a first order discontinuity (Taub 1978; Anile & Russo 1986). The mass and the energy-momentum conservation across this discontinuity demands that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \zeta(\rho u^\mu)_- = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \zeta(\rho u^\mu)_+ \quad (15a)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \zeta(T^{\mu\nu})_- = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \zeta(T^{\mu\nu})_+ \quad (15b)$$

where, the signs $-$ and $+$ denote the quantities before and after the shock respectively. The above equations could be written as,

$$\rho_- u_-^\mu n_\mu = \rho_+ u_+^\mu n_\mu \quad (16a)$$

and

$$p_- n^\nu + (p_- + \rho_-)(u_-^\mu n_\mu) u_-^\nu = p_+ n^\nu + (p_+ + \rho_+)(u_+^\mu n_\mu) u_+^\nu \quad (16b)$$

Here, n_μ is the four normal vector component across the shock.

In the next two sections we shall provide explicit examples of global solutions of the above set of equations, with or without shocks. First, we present an approximate method to obtain global shock surfaces.

3. SURFACES OF STRONG SHOCKS IN ACCRETION AND WINDS

From Eq. (16b) one notices that at a shock surface, the sum of ram pressure (due to radial motion) and thermal pressure is continuous across the surface. Presently, we wish to obtain the nature of this surface assuming that in the strong shock limit one can ignore the pre-shock thermal pressure compared to the ram pressure. In this limit, (Novikov & Thorne, 1973),

$$\rho_+ \sim \frac{\gamma + 1}{\gamma - 1} \rho_- \quad (17a)$$

and

$$V_+ \sim \frac{\gamma - 1}{\gamma + 1} V_- \quad (17b)$$

where, γ is the adiabatic index. Strictly speaking above assumption is valid for isothermal flows $\gamma = 1$ only. However, to get a rough approximation of the global behavior, we assume that this is valid for $\gamma = 4/3$ also. For the post-shock quantities, we ignore radial motion to compute thermal pressure, although we include the ram pressure obtained using Eq. (17b) along with the thermal pressure to obtain the shock surfaces. (We do not include turbulent pressure here since it involves an extra parameter, although we believe it's effect is important as concluded by MLC94.) Thus, assuming that the post-shock region is predominantly rotating, one obtains from Eq. (2) (e.g., Bardeen, 1973),

$$\frac{\nabla_i p}{p + \rho} + \frac{\nabla_i u_t}{u_t} = \frac{\Omega \nabla_i l}{(1 - \Omega l)}. \quad (18)$$

In this limit the equation could be integrated for any power law angular momentum distribution (C85),

$$l = c_\phi \lambda^{n_\phi} \quad (19)$$

provided a barotropic equation of state $p = p(\rho)$ is chosen. Here, c_ϕ and n_ϕ denote two positive constants with $0.0 \lesssim n_\phi \lesssim 0.5$ in the disk region. This latter constant actually represents the viscosity of the flow: for a small viscosity, angular momentum is nearly constant and $n_\phi \sim 0$. For high viscosity, the angular momentum is nearly Keplerian, $n_\phi \sim 0.5$. Also, the von-Zeipel parameter (e.g., C85; Chakrabarti, 1991) λ is given by,

$$\lambda^2 = \frac{l}{\Omega} = -\frac{lg_{\phi\phi} + l^2 g_{t\phi}}{g_{t\phi} + lg_{tt}} \quad (20)$$

We choose a flow with equation of state $p = K\rho_0^\gamma$, where K is a constant. Using a distribution given by Eq. (19) one obtains the enthalpy $h = (p + \rho)/\rho_0 = 1/(1 - na_s^2)$ (with sound speed a_s defined by, $a_s^2 = \frac{\partial p}{\partial \rho}|_s$ at constant entropy s . $n = [\gamma - 1]^{-1}$ is the polytropic index) distribution from Eq. (18) as,

$$hu_t(1 - \Omega l)^\alpha = \mathcal{E}, \quad (21)$$

where,

$$\alpha = \frac{n_\phi}{2n_\phi - 2}. \quad (22)$$

Equation (21) represents the general relativistic Bernoulli equation. Here, due to the variation of angular momentum, the specific energy $hu_t = \mathcal{E}_0$ is not conserved. Only in an inviscid flow, i.e., for $n_\phi = 0$, $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_0$. The time component of velocity u_t , which is also the specific binding energy, could be obtained from Eq. (3) as,

$$u_t = \left[\frac{g_{t\phi}^2 - g_{tt}g_{\phi\phi}}{(g_{\phi\phi} + lg_{t\phi})(1 - \Omega l)(1 - V^2)} \right]^{1/2} \quad (23)$$

Before the incoming matter hits this predominantly rotating flow configuration, its thermal pressure was negligible, and assuming the same angular momentum distribution (Eq. 19) in the pre-shock flow one obtains the ram pressure distribution from the following equation,

$$u_t(1 - \Omega l)^\alpha = \mathcal{E}, \quad (24)$$

Here we have chosen specific enthalpy $h = 1$ for a cold inflow in the pre-shock region. One need not have an angular momentum distribution as given by Eq. (19) in the pre-shock region, since the barotropic flow is no longer pre-dominantly rotating, and therefore the von-Zeipel theorem (Tassoul, 1978) need not be strictly imposed. But we choose it anyway so as to obtain a purely compressible shock wave where the angular momentum remains continuous across the shock. In any case, our conclusions are not found to be qualitatively different if the factor $(1 - \Omega l)^\alpha$ is dropped instead.

At the shock surface, the pressure balance equation (16b) takes the form:

$$p_+ + (p_+ + \rho_+)V_+^2/(1 - V_+^2) \sim (p_- + \rho_-)\frac{V_-^2}{1 - V_-^2} \quad (25)$$

Note that we have not taken the projection of velocity along the normal to the shock surface here. This is because in the strong shock limit that we are considering here, the surfaces of constant ram pressure outside the shock and the surfaces of constant thermal pressure inside the shock would have similar functional dependence through $u_t(r, \theta)$. Thus locally the ram pressure gradient is parallel to the thermal pressure gradient at each point on the shock surface.

Combining Eqs. (17a,b) and Eq. (25) we obtain the pressure balance condition at the shock as,

$$\frac{na_s^2}{1 - na_s^2} \sim \frac{2\gamma}{(\gamma + 1)^2} \frac{V_-^2}{1 - V_-^2}. \quad (26)$$

Figs. 1a-b show examples of the shock surfaces (S, solid curves) and the contours (short dashed curves) of constant thermal pressure inside the shock surface while the contours of constant ram pressure outside the shock surface. Contours are in axial distance $R = r \sin \theta$ vs. vertical distance $Z = r \cos \theta$ (namely, in meridional) plane. The parameters we choose are $a = 0.95$, $c_\phi = 2.3$, $n_\phi = 0.05$ and $\gamma = 4/3$. We also show the funnel surface defined as the zero pressure surface (F) and the centrifugal barrier (CF) defined by the surface of maximum pressure ($\nabla p = 0$). In a predominantly rotating flow (Eq. 18), the vanishing pressure gradient implies that only competing forces at CF are the centrifugal, gravitational and Coriolis' forces (in Newtonian terminology). Thus, the centrifugal barrier resembles the Keplerian distribution, so to speak. In Fig. 1a, we choose $\mathcal{E} = 1.001$ constant at the outer boundary at $R = 50$. In this case, the shock surface that begins on the equatorial plane bends inside. This is because the radial velocity becomes smaller as the matter approaches the centrifugal barrier and the flow has to move in farther to match the thermal pressure. The segment of the shock surface inside the centrifugal barrier is not physical for accretion flow, as the flow has to move outwards to form them. This segment is however, physical for winds blowing outwards. Thus both the winds and accretion can have shock waves simultaneously in different regions of the flow. The segment outside the centrifugal barrier is equivalent to the shock at x_{s3} in the notation of C89 and the segment inside the centrifugal barrier is equivalent to x_{s2} in the notation of C89. As shown in Chakrabarti & Molteni (1993), in a polytropic flow, x_{s3} is stable for accretion while x_{s2} is stable for winds.

In Fig. 1b, we artificially choose an outer boundary condition where the specific energy of the flow increases as one goes away from the equatorial plane. We choose: $\mathcal{E}(\theta) = 0.03 \cos \theta + \mathcal{E}(\theta = \pi/2)$, where $\theta = 0$ coincides with the vertical axis. Motivation for this choice is that in an astrophysical situation (as well as in a typical numerical simulation) infall radial and sound velocities are constants at the outer boundary. At a higher elevation, the potential energy decreases, so the net specific energy increases. The flow forms a shock farther away from the axis as less centrifugal force is required to balance the weakened gravity. In all the numerical simulation results reported (HSW85, HSW85, H84, MLC94, MRC96) such shock

waves which bend outwards are seen. Indeed in H84, several examples of shocks which bend back towards the vertical axis at a even higher latitude are reported exactly as shown in Fig. 1b. After the flow passes through this oblique shock, the energy may be randomized, and another shock of the type shown in Fig. 1a may be formed. These are seen in MLC94 and MRC96 as well.

Note that in the strong shock limit that we discuss here, the outer sonic surface lies at infinity, while the inner sonic surface lies arbitrarily close to the horizon. This is simply because the flow is chosen to be very cold $a_s = 0$ in the pre-shock flow and almost static $V \sim 0$ in the post-shock flow. When these constraints are relaxed, as in our analysis in the next section, the outer sonic point *moves in* from infinity to a few tens to a few hundreds of Schwarzschild radii, while the inner sonic point *moves out* to roughly one to three Schwarzschild radii as see in pseudo-Newtonian geometry (C89, C90).

4. SHOCKS AND SHOCK-FREE SOLUTIONS IN A CONICAL WEDGE FLOW

In the last section we concentrated on strong shock solutions. Presently, we study solutions of the transonic flows around a rotating black hole in full generality. General procedures for obtaining such solutions using pseudo-Newtonian potential have already been in numerous works, and we shall not repeat them here (see, C89, C90, C96b). We use this weak viscosity limit of the equations of Section 2 to obtain the zeroth order distribution of velocity and sound speed etc. Subsequently, we compute the effects of viscosity on this zeroth order distribution. Computation of heating and cooling effects are also done in the same way.

Before proceeding further, we would like to argue that the conical flows have all the properties similar to other types of thin flows, such as flows in vertical equilibrium and flows of constant thickness. Different models can really be mapped onto each other by varying the polytropic constant appropriately. To show this, we consider a gram of matter of specific energy $\mathcal{E}$ and specific angular momentum l in Newtonian geometry:

$$\mathcal{E} = \frac{1}{2}V^2 + n_i a_s^2 + \frac{l^2}{2r^2} - \frac{1}{r}. \quad (27a)$$

Using the equation of state $p = K\rho^\gamma$ (where $\gamma = 1 + 1/n$ is the adiabatic index, and K is a constant), the mass accretion rate on the equatorial plane

$$\dot{M}_i = \rho V r^q \quad (27b)$$

could be re-written as,

$$\dot{\mathcal{M}}_i = V a_s^{\nu_i} r^{q_i} \quad (27c)$$

where $\dot{\mathcal{M}}_i$ is an entropy dependent quantity $\propto \dot{M}_i K^{n_i}$. Here V is the radial velocity and the subscript i differentiates one model from another. For spherical or conical flows, ($i = 1$, say), $q_1 = 2$, $\nu_1 = 2n_1$, while for a thin flow of constant height ($i = 2$, say), $q_2 = 1$, $\nu_2 = 2n_2$ and finally,

for a thin flow in vertical equilibrium ($i = 3$, say), $q_3 = 5/2$, $\nu_3 = 2n_3 + 1$. It can be easily shown that the properties at the sonic points remain identical in all these three models, provided, the polytropic indexes are modified according to the relation,

$$\frac{2n_1 - 3}{4} = \frac{2n_2 - 1}{2} = \frac{2n_3 - 3}{5}. \quad (28)$$

Due to non-linearity, a cleaner relation such as this is impossible in general relativity. But we expect the situation to be similar. Therefore, we feel confident that a conical wedge shaped flow can capture the physical process as any other thin flow model.

In the case weakly viscous flow, Eq. (6) could be integrated to give the energy conservation,

$$hu_t = \frac{p + \rho}{\rho_0} u_t = \mathcal{E}. \quad (29a)$$

The baryon number conservation relation remains the same as Eq. (7), with the flow cross-section area to be $A \propto 2\pi r^2 \sin \theta \delta\theta$ where $\delta\theta$ is the angular width of the flow around the angle θ with the vertical axis (in C90, a simpler accretion rate was used to obtain solutions in Kerr geometry) Thus,

$$\dot{M} = 2\pi\rho_0 r^2 u^r = \text{constant} \quad (29b)$$

and finally, the angular momentum conservation equation (Eq. 8) becomes simply,

$$hu_\phi = \frac{p + \rho}{\rho_0} u_\phi = -\mathcal{L}. \quad (29c)$$

We solve these equations by using the standard sonic point analysis. First rewrite the energy and mass conservation equations as (e.g., Shapiro & Teukolsky, 1983),

$$\mathcal{E} = \frac{1}{1 - na_s^2} \frac{1}{(1 - V^2)^{1/2}} F(r, \theta) \quad (30a)$$

and

$$\dot{\mathcal{M}} = \left(\frac{a_s^2}{1 - na_s^2} \right)^n \frac{V}{(1 - V^2)^{1/2}} G(r, \theta) \quad (30b)$$

where,

$$F(r, \theta) = \left[\frac{g_{t\phi}^2 - g_{tt}g_{\phi\phi}}{(g_{\phi\phi} + l g_{t\phi})(1 - \Omega l)} \right]^{1/2}$$

and

$$G(r, \theta) = \frac{r^2 \sin \theta}{g_{rr}^{1/2}}.$$

Here, we have neglected θ component of velocity u_θ compared to the other two spatial components u_r and u_ϕ . This assumption need not be valid, especially in the immediate post-shock region, where u_r itself becomes small enough. However, we believe that we can capture the basic physics of transonic flows this approximation. The quantity $\dot{\mathcal{M}}$ will be called the entropy function (earlier,

in C89 & C90, the terminology of ‘accretion rate’ was used for this quantity, though it was distinguished from the mass flux $\dot{M}$) as $\dot{\mathcal{M}} \propto K^n \dot{M}$. It usually assumes two different values at two saddle type sonic points and the one with the smallest $\dot{\mathcal{M}}$ joins the horizon at infinity (C90). In a flow which contains shocks, matter first passes through this transonic solution of lower entropy, and then through a shock and finally through the sonic point which requires a higher entropy.

Differentiating equations (30a) and (30b) with respect to r (for a given $\theta = \theta_0$) and eliminating terms involving derivatives of a_s , we obtain,

$$\frac{dV}{dr} = \frac{N}{D} = \frac{c_1 a_2 - c_2 a_1}{b_1 a_2 - b_2 a_1} \quad (31)$$

where,

$$a_1 = \frac{2na_s}{1 - na_s^2}, \quad (32a)$$

$$a_2 = \frac{2n}{a_s(1 - na_s^2)}, \quad (32b)$$

$$b_1 = \frac{V}{1 - V^2}, \quad (32c)$$

$$b_2 = \frac{1}{V(1 - V^2)}, \quad (32d)$$

$$c_1 = \frac{1}{F(r, \theta_0)} \frac{dF(r, \theta_0)}{dr}, \quad (32e)$$

$$c_2 = \frac{1}{G(r, \theta_0)} \frac{dG(r, \theta_0)}{dr}, \quad (32f)$$

From the vanishing condition of D and N at the sonic points, one obtains the so called sonic point conditions as,

$$V_c = a_{s,c} \quad (33a)$$

and

$$V_c^2 = \frac{c_1}{c_2}|_c \quad (33b)$$

Here, the subscript ‘c’ refers to the quantities evaluated at the sonic point $r = r_c$.

In the study of inviscid accretion flows, one supplies the conserved quantities, such as l , $\mathcal{E}$, etc. to obtain a complete solution. For a given angular momentum l , the remaining unknowns are $V(r)$, $a_s(r)$. But one requires only one extra boundary condition, e.g. $\mathcal{E}$, since two sonic point conditions (33a,b) introduce only one extra unknown r_c . Both the quantities l and $\mathcal{E}$ could be functions of θ in general and one has to supply another constant equivalent of the Carter constant (Chandrasekhar, 1983) to describe flows in the region away from the equatorial plane. However, since we let $u_\theta = 0$ everywhere, we do not have such a choice any more. Thus, the supply of the specific energy $\mathcal{E}$ and the specific angular momentum l is sufficient to obtain a complete solution from the horizon to infinity. Note that by definition Ω is the same as ω on the horizon. At the shock, apart from the continuity of the energy and the mass flux, one must also satisfy the relativistic momentum balance condition, Eq. 16(a-b).

4.1. Classification of the Parameter Space

A solution, with or without a shock, can be completely described by the choice of either $(l, \dot{\mathcal{M}})$ or $(l, \mathcal{E})$ pair. As in a flow in a pseudo-Newtonian geometry (Fig. 2 and Fig. 4 of C89), one can classify the entire parameter space in $(l, \dot{\mathcal{M}})$ or $(l, \mathcal{E})$ plane in terms of whether or not the flow has one or more sonic points and shocks. Fig. 2 shows such a classification (for $a = 0.95$) for the flow on the equatorial plane ($\theta = \pi/2$). The parameter space is sub-divided into nine regions. Flows with parameters from the region N has no transonic solution. The solutions from the region ‘O’ have only the outer sonic point. The solutions from the regions NSA and SA have two ‘X’ type sonic points with the entropy density S_o at the outer sonic point *less* than the entropy density S_i at the inner sonic point. However, flows from SA can pass through a standing shock (See, Figs. 3 and 4 below) as the Rankine-Hugoniot condition is satisfied. The entropy generated at the shock is exactly $S_i - S_o$, which is advected towards the black hole to enable the flow to pass through the inner sonic point. Rankine-Hugoniot condition is not satisfied for flows from the region NSA . Numerical simulation indicates (Ryu, Chakrabarti & Molteni, 1997) that the solution is very unstable and show periodic changes in shock locations. The flow from the region SW and NSW are very similar to those from SA and NSA . However, $S_o \geq S_i$ in these cases. Shocks can form only in winds from the region SW . The shock condition is not satisfied in winds from the region NSW . This may make the NSW flows unstable as well. However, stable accretion can take place through the inner sonic point. A flow from region I only has the inner sonic point and thus can form shocks (which require the presence of two saddle type sonic points) only if the inflow is already supersonic due to some other physical processes. See C90 and Chakrabarti (1996c) for all the topologies of the flow.

The flows from regions I^* and O^* are interesting in the sense that each of them has two sonic points (one ‘X’ type and one ‘O’ type) only and neither produces a globally complete solution (in the inviscid case, at least). The region I^* has an inner sonic point but the solution does not extend subsonically to a large distance. The region O^* has an outer sonic point, but the solution does not extend supersonically to the horizon! In both the cases a weakly viscous flow is expected to be unstable. When a significant viscosity is added, the closed topology of I^* is expected to open up (C90, C96b) and then the flow can join with a Keplerian disk. Clearly, advective disks from this region of parameter space will have no standing shocks independent of what polytropic index is used unless some extra energizing mechanism (such as flares) in the sub-Keplerian region raises the specific energy of the flow to bring it to the parameter space marked ‘SA’.

4.2. Behavior of Shock Locations on the Equatorial Plane

First, we study the properties of the shock waves on the equatorial plane ($\theta = \pi/2$). Our goal is to see if the shocks in a true black hole geometry display similar properties as those in pseudo-Newtonian geometry. With a pseudo-Newtonian geometry, it was noted that for given

flow parameters, there are two locations x_{s2} and x_{s3} where shocks form in between two saddle type sonic points. Later, it was found (Chakrabarti & Molteni, 1993; also see Nakayama, 1992 for isothermal flows) that x_{s3} is stable in accretion and x_{s2} is stable in winds. In Fig. 2, we show shock locations in four cases, (a) $a = 0$, $l = 3.5$, (b) $a = 0.5$, $l = 3.0$, (c) $a = 0.95$, $l = 2.3$ and (d) $a = 0.95$, $l = 2.1$ as a function of the specific energy of the flow. Each ‘Persian bottle’ shaped set is marked with the above parameters. Each set contains four curves, two dashed and two solid. The dashed curve on the lower left (a_2) corresponds to the unstable shock x_{s2} of accretion flow and the solid curve on the upper left (a_3) corresponds to the stable shock x_{s3} of accretion flow. The solid curve on the lower right (w_2) corresponds to the stable shock x_{s2} of the wind flow and the dashed curve on the upper right (w_3) corresponds to the unstable shock x_{s3} of wind flow. This description is applicable to *each* set. First notice that the shocks are possible on the equatorial plane for a certain range of energy values only. The general behavior of the shock location is *exactly* same as in pseudo-Newtonian geometry (C89; C90; Chakrabarti & Molteni, 1993). What is more, the range of energy for which shocks are possible in a rapidly rotating black hole is much higher compared to that around a non-rotating black hole. On the average, the shock locations are closer to the horizon for flows around a rotating black hole.

4.3. Shear, Heating and Cooling in a Viscous flow

Since the nature of the transonic solution including the formation of shocks depends on angular momentum distribution, which in turn depend very strongly upon viscosity cooling and heating, it is instructive to study their behavior. Presently, we study then in the weak viscosity limit, where the velocity and density distributions are chosen from the inviscid flows while computing shear, heating and cooling. The complete solutions of the viscous transonic flow which self-consistently compute these quantities along with the flow variables (such as, velocity, density, etc.) will be dealt with elsewhere.

Around a Newtonian star, shear component due to purely rotational motion is defined as $\sigma_{r\phi} = rd\Omega/dr$ which is always positive (e.g, $3/2\Omega$ for a Keplerian disk), and hence viscous stress is always negative. That is, angular momentum is always transported outwards. However, Anderson & Lemos (1988) pointed out that the shear can change sign near the horizon and they demonstrated this using velocity profiles of a cold radial flow below marginally stable orbit. Below, we show that at least for a weakly viscous flow shear indeed changes its sign close to a black hole.

In Fig. 4, we show the behavior of shear components σ_ϕ^r for a prograde and a retrograde flow. In the upper left panel, we show the Mach number variation of the flow with $a = 0.95$, $l = 2.3$, $\mathcal{E} = 1.001$. The arrowed path shows that two transonic solutions are ‘glued’ together by the vertical shock transition (at a_3 or x_{s3} in our notation) where Rankine Hugoniot condition is satisfied. On the upper right panel, We present $\sigma_{\phi p}^r$ and $\sigma_{\phi|rot}^r$ which are the general shear and the rotational shear (Eq. 9) for the supersonic branch passing through the outer sonic point (subscripts ‘p’ and ‘b’ are for supersonic and subsonic branches, respectively).

For comparison, we also show $\sigma_{\phi b}^r$ (general shear for the subsonic branch passing through the outer sonic point) and $d\Omega/dr$ (which is independent of any branch). One arrives at several important conclusions: First, the effect of radial motion is significant in changing the shear stress. The rotational shear $\sigma_{\phi|rot}^r$ as well as $\sigma_{\phi b}^r$ where the radial velocity is negligible, vanish at the horizon, while the $\sigma_{\phi p}^r$ does not. Indeed, $\sigma_{\phi p}^r$ is a very large negative quantity, and therefore in presence of even a weak viscosity it can transport angular momentum inwards. This does not automatically imply that the angular momentum distribution will develop a minimum (such as in the Keplerian distribution), see Fig. 5 below. In reality, this inward transport may try to nullify a steeper distribution with a positive slope and makes it as flat as possible near the horizon. The lower left panel of Fig. 4 gives the variation of Mach numbers for a retrograde flow with $a = 0.95$, $l = -4.0$, $\mathcal{E} = 1.0045$. Note that both the subsonic and supersonic branches behave qualitatively similarly, although that from the supersonic branch ($\sigma_{\phi p}^r$) becomes extremely large positive quantity before turning back to become a large negative just outside the horizon. We have not plotted the shear distribution for the post-shock branches passing through the inner sonic points, as their behaviors are similar. What is very much clear is that a simple Shakura-Sunyaev (1973) type viscous stress $\propto -\alpha p$ with a constant α will not be very accurate, specially close to the black hole, since the pressure p is always positive while actual stress changes sign!

The reversal of the shear close to a black hole is no mystery. In general relativity, all the energies couple one another. It is well known that the ‘pit in the potential’ of a black hole is due to coupling between the rotational energy and the gravitational energy (see, Chakrabarti, 1993 and references therein). As matter approaches the black hole, the rotational energy, and therefore ‘mass’ due to the energy increases which is also attracted by the black hole. This makes gravity much stronger than that of a Newtonian star. When the black hole rotates, there are more coupling terms (such as that arises out of spin of the black hole and the orbital angular momentum of the matter) which either favor gravity or go against it depending on whether the flow is retrograde or prograde respectively. This is the basic reason why retrograde and prograde flows display different reversal properties.

Given that the shear is a very large negative number close to a horizon, for a physical flow, one must have the viscosity vanishing on the horizon in order to have finite angular momentum or the viscous dissipation. Fig. 5 shows the distribution of angular momentum (upper panel) and the heating and cooling rates (lower panel) in the pre-shock (with subscript ‘pre’) and post-shock (with subscript ‘post’) solutions for the prograde flow presented in Fig. 4 above. We also present the Keplerian distribution (l_K) in the upper panel for comparison. We assume ion viscosity (Spitzer, 1962) with a factor $(1 - r_+/r)^\beta$ in order that it vanishes on the horizon sufficiently rapidly (we use $\beta = 1$ here). The same variation is used to compute viscous heating rate:

$$Q^+ = 2\eta\sigma_{\mu\nu}\sigma^{\mu\nu} = -\frac{4\eta}{\Delta}\sigma_{r\phi}\sigma_{\phi}^r(\Omega^2 g_{\phi\phi} + 2\Omega g_{t\phi} + g_{tt}) \quad (34)$$

Note that the quantity in the parenthesis has to be negative in order to obtain positive heating. This is indeed always the case for any realistic flow (e.g., Shapiro & Teukolsky, 1983). For the

cooling, we simply use bremsstrahlung process. In presence of a Keplerian disk farther out, Comptonization of the intercepted photons is likely to dominate (Chakrabarti & Titarchuk, 1995). We chose $M_{bh} = 1M_{\odot}$ and $\dot{M} = \dot{M}_{Eddington}$ for illustration purposes (as we are interested in general behavior, and not the absolute magnitude). In the upper panel, dotted curve is the angular momentum distribution in the preshock branch and solid curve is that in the post-shock branch. The dotted vertical arrow is at the shock location. In the lower panel the solid curves are viscous dissipation rate and the dotted curves are the bremsstrahlung cooling rate. Clearly, since the post-shock flow is hotter, ion viscosity is higher. This causes a rapid transfer of angular momentum as well as a higher heating and cooling rates in the post-shock region. In reality, when flow velocity, sound speed etc. are computed simultaneously, the effect becomes much weaker, and the piling up of angular momentum would either move the shock outward, or the shock may disappear completely as has been observed in recent numerical simulations (see, C96a and References therein). Most of the heat generated in the present case is carried away towards the black hole, since bremsstrahlung is not efficient enough to cool the flow. This is similar to the inviscid case where energy remained conserved (C89), or in viscous pseudo-Newtonian flows with inefficient cooling (C96a, C96b).

Instead of using ion viscosity, if one used parametrized kinematic viscosity such as $\nu \sim \alpha c_s r$ where, c_s is the isothermal sound speed and α is the Shakura-Sunayev (1973) viscosity parameter, then also we would have exactly the same behavior as above. However, for finite heating and angular momentum transport rate, α must vanish ‘sufficiently rapidly’ on the horizon. This suggests that it is essential to have a fundamental change in viscous processes very close to the horizon. A constant α description may be adequate for ‘predominately rotating flows’, however, since the rotational shear $\sigma_{\phi}^r|_{rot}$ vanishes on the horizon (Fig. 4). Such predominantly rotating flows do not satisfy the boundary condition $V = 1$ on the horizon and we prefer to conjecture that the turbulence and viscosity be completely damped out on the horizon instead (‘tranquil inflow conjecture’).

4.4. Shock Location away from the Equatorial plane

If one considers conical flows away from the equatorial plane, the shocks are generally expected to recede from the axis. This is simply because away from the plane the gravitational force diminishes so that less centrifugal force is required to form a shock. For illustration, we consider the same three cases as in the above sub-section, but we choose a particular energy $\mathcal{E} = 1.004$ for all the three cases. From Fig. 3, we note that shock solutions on the equatorial plane exist for all the three cases at this energy. In Fig. 6, we show the variation of shock location (dotted curves marked with S) with height in the $R - Z$ plane. For comparison, we show the funnel wall (solid curves marked with F) and the centrifugal barrier (long dashed curves marked with CF). The outer most curve in each set is for $a = 0$, the middle curve is for $a = 0.5$ and the innermost curve is for $a = 0.95$. The location of the shock is more distant from the vertical axis at

a higher elevation. The shock strengths (measured by the ratio of pre-shock to post-shock Mach numbers M_-/M_+) fall sharply with increasing latitude. The shocks in accretion flows typically exist in the range $\theta_{max} \geq \theta \geq \theta_{min,a}$ (see Fig. 7 below), where θ_{max} is not necessarily $\pi/2$. In other words, even for parameters which do not allow shocks on the equatorial plane, the flow may have shocks starting at an angle $\theta_{max} < \pi/2$ away from the equatorial plane and extending up to $\theta_{min,a}$. This happens when the energy is less than the lower limit of energy required for the shock in the equatorial plane (which is different for different cases as depicted in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3). For instance, flows from the region *NSA* (Fig. 2) would have shocks at a higher elevation, though on the equatorial plane shocks were not allowed. Beyond $\theta_{min,a}$, the flow can have stable shock x_{s2} only in winds up to some other $\theta_{min,w}$. These shocks form very close to the centrifugal barrier near the black hole, and for clarity we do not draw them. These shocks also bend away from the vertical axis at higher elevations. Similar to accretion flows, winds can develop shocks at higher elevation when the energy is more than the highest energy required for shocks on the equatorial plane (which is different in different cases as depicted in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3). Thus flows from region *NSW* (Fig. 2) would have shocks in winds at higher elevation. Again for clarity we have not plotted outer and inner sonic surfaces. These ‘annular shocks’ are observed in simulations of Ryu et al. (1995) and Ryu, Chakrabarti and Molteni, (1996). The outer sonic surface is very close to spherical (as it is hundreds of Schwarzschild radii away, and therefore insensitive to rotational effects) moving in slightly with elevation. The inner sonic surface located close to the horizon moves inwards with elevation at a comparatively faster rate.

In Fig. 7 we compare the entropy function $\dot{\mathcal{M}}$ for all the three cases discussed in §4.2 as a function of θ ($\theta = 90$ corresponds to the equatorial plane). For a given mass accretion rate $\dot{M}$ for all the three cases, these curves measure the entropy of the flow and the amount of entropy that is generated at the shock. The three dashed curves, roughly overlapping each other are the entropy functions at the outer sonic surfaces. These sonic surfaces being very far away, their properties are almost independent of the state of the black hole or the (sub-Keplerian) angular momentum of matter. These are the entropies of the pre-shock flow since no entropy is generated before the flow hits the shock. The solid curves represent the entropy of the post-shock flow which pass through the inner sonic surfaces. Clearly, the flow around the rapidly rotating black hole is the hottest and has the highest entropy. The difference in entropy between the outer and the inner sonic surfaces must be generated at the shock. Therefore, a higher jump (at a given angle) in entropy represents a stronger shock. Note that at some $\theta_{min,a}$ the solid and dashed curves intersect. That is the location (angle) where the weakest shock (with strength unity) forms. For $\theta_{min,a} < \theta \leq \pi/2$, the shock in accretion flow can form, since it has to *generate* entropy at the shock. Beyond that the entropy at the outer sonic surface is lower than that from the inner sonic surface, and the shocks are formed only in winds. Accretion flow with these parameters will not have shocks. This process continues till $\theta_{min,w} \sim 60$ degrees. Beyond that angle, shocks will not form in winds as well.

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper, we studied the general behavior of the transonic solutions, with or without shocks, in two dimensional accretion and winds. We employed fully general relativistic equations for viscous transonic flows for this purpose. We show that the behavior of shock waves on the equatorial plane is very similar to what had been found using pseudo-Newtonian potential. However, for rotating black holes, the range of parameter space which allows the formation of shock waves is much larger. Similarly, flows away from the plane form shocks more easily. These studies therefore imply that shocks in quasi-spherical accretion flows are perhaps more generic. Furthermore, it can be easily shown, by employing a perturbation of pressures on both sides of the shocks, that these shocks are stable as well (Chakrabarti & Molteni, 1993). Both of these deductions from purely analytical considerations as presented in this paper are borne out by every numerical simulations to date (HSW84, HSW85, H84, MLC94, MRC96). These simulations always find very large scale stable oblique shocks in a black hole accretion. In case when the flow is bound, namely $\mathcal{E} < 1$, the flow does not have outer sonic point, and does not extend to a large distance (region I^* in Fig. 2). Only when viscosity is added, the closed topology around ‘O’ type sonic point opens up to join a Keplerian disk farther out. Shocks can form on the equatorial plane in this case only when the inflow is already supersonic, though away from the plane the flow may have $\mathcal{E} \geq 1$ and stable shocks will form. This considerations were used to explain the spectral properties of black hole candidates (Chakrabarti & Titarchuk, 1995). In the advective corona $\mathcal{E} \geq 1$ condition could also be achieved by energy deposition in the corona through magnetic flares (for instance) a method which is widely accepted in high energy astrophysics.

Our ‘brute force’ method of global shock study (Section 3) solves the mystery that was first noticed by Fukue (1987) and subsequently by C89 as to the multiplicity in formal shock locations. Since the transonic flow we consider are necessarily non-Keplerian, they typically tend to have a pressure maximum exactly as in a thick accretion disk. As a result, the shock condition is satisfied once on each side of the maximum. Our method also reveals why the outer shock is stable in accretion and inner shock is stable in winds. In both the cases we see that the thermal pressure must increase downstream. In fact, for a highly viscous flow the pressure maxima and consequently the shocks are absent (C96b).

Since general topology of the solutions depend on angular momentum distribution, we also studied the behavior of shear for a transonic flow. We conclude that shear is not monotonic close to a black hole. In fact it may reverse several times due to coupling of various energies in general relativity. Because of this we believe that neither α viscosity prescription, nor computation based on predominantly rotating flow (rotational shear, Eq. [9]) should be adequate. We find that heating is very strong close to the black hole, and the generated heat must be advected away with the flow if the cooling is not very efficient. This is similar to inviscid case (e.g. C89), where the entire energy and entropy at the shock was advected by the optically thin flow. The post-shock solution is observed to transport angular momentum more rapidly and as a result the shock may either move away from the black hole, or it may disappear if the viscosity is high enough. These

results agree with our earlier computations in pseudo-Newtonian flows.

Since black holes have no hard surface one would imagine that matter would enter through the horizon without decelerating. But it seems that the centrifugal barrier by even a small amount of angular momentum in the flow causes the matter to pile up behind the barrier over a large scale, not just near the equatorial plane. Indeed, we found that the probability of formation of the shocks away from the plane is much higher, simply because the barrier is definitely present away from the plane (due to weaker gravity) even when it is absent on the equatorial plane (such as when the angular momentum of the flow is everywhere sub-Keplerian close to the black hole). Our present findings support the view that the black hole accretion models may need to include shock waves (at least for flows at higher elevation) as they provide a complete explanation of the observed steady state as well as time dependent behaviors (e.g., Chakrabarti & Titarchuk, 1995; Ryu, Chakrabarti & Molteni, 1997; Crary et al, 1996). For instance, according to our model, quasi-periodic oscillations of black hole candidates should have frequencies of the order of $1/(4x_s^{3/2})$ (Molteni, Sponholz & Chakrabarti, 1996) and therefore can vary from a few millihertz to kilohertz range depending on shock locations (Fig. 3) with modulation amplitude as much as 100 percent. This roughly agrees with the observed frequencies and amplitudes.

The author is thankful to his colleagues D. Ryu and D. Molteni for excellent numerical simulations which partly motivated him to complete the present work. He is also thankful to J. Hawley for giving him a copy of his thesis ten years ago, which contained insightful illustrations which were helpful in understanding two dimensional transonic flows. He thanks J. Peitz, R. Khanna and Kip Thorne for discussions.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, M.R. & Lemos, J.P.S 1988, MNRAS, 233, 489.
- Anile, A.M. & Russo, G. 1986, Phys. Fluids, 29, 2847.
- Bondi, H. 1952, MNRAS, 112, 195.
- Bardeen, J. 1973, in *Black Holes*, eds. C. DeWitt & B. DeWitt, (Gordon and Breach, New York).
- Crary, D.J. et al, 1996, ApJL (May 10th issue).
- Chakrabarti, S. K. 1985, ApJ, 288, 1 (C85).
- Chakrabarti, S. K. 1989, ApJ, 347, 365 (C89).
- Chakrabarti, S. K. 1990, Theory of Transonic Astrophysical Flows (World Scientific, Singapore) (C90)
- Chakrabarti, S. K. 1991, MNRAS, 250, 7.
- Chakrabarti, S. K. 1993, ApJ 261, 625.
- Chakrabarti, S. K. 1996a, Phys. Rep., 266, No. 5-6, 238.
- Chakrabarti, S. K. 1996b, ApJ, (June 20th), (C96b).
- Chakrabarti, S. K. 1996c, MNRAS (in press).
- Chakrabarti, S. K., & Molteni, D. 1993, ApJ, 417, 671 (CM93).
- Chakrabarti, S. K., & Titarchuk, L. G. 1995, ApJ, 455, 623.
- Chakrabarti, S. K., & Wiita, P.J. 1992, ApJ, 387, L21.
- Chandrasekhar, S. 1983, Mathematical Theory of Black Holes, (Oxford University Press, New York).
- Fukue, J. 1987, PASJ, 39, 309.
- Hawley, J. F. 1984, Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. of Illinois at Urbana Champaign. (H84)
- Hawley, J. F., Smarr, L. L., & Wilson, J. R. 1984, ApJ, 277, 296 (HSW84).
- Hawley, J. F., Smarr, L. L., & Wilson, J. R. 1985, ApJ Suppl., 55, 211.
- Lynden-Bell, D. 1978, Phys. Scripta, 17, 185.
- Molteni, D., Lanzafame, G., & Chakrabarti, S. K. 1994, ApJ, 425, 161 (MLC94).

- Molteni, D., Sponholz, H., & Chakrabarti, S. K. 1996, Feb. 1st.
- Molteni, D., Ryu, D. & Chakrabarti, S. K. 1996, ApJ (Oct. 10th issue) (MRC96).
- Nakayama, K. 1992 MNRAS 259, 259.
- Novikov, I., & Thorne, K. S. 1973, in Black Holes, eds. C. DeWitt and B. DeWitt (Gordon and Breach, New York).
- Paczyński, B., & Bisnovatyi-Kogan, G. 1981, Acta Astron. 31, 1.
- Paczyński, B., & Wiita, P. J. 1980, A&Ap, 88, 23.
- Peitz, J. Diplom thesis, University of Heidelberg, 1994.
- Ryu, D., Brown, G. L., Ostriker, J. P., and Loeb, A. 1995, ApJ, 452, 364.
- Ryu, D., Chakrabarti, S. K., & Molteni, D. 1997, ApJ (in press).
- Shakura, N. I., & Sunyaev, R. A. 1973, A&A, 24, 337.
- Shapiro, S.L., & Teukolsky, S. A. 1983, Black Holes, White Dwarfs, and Neutron Stars, (John Wiley: New York).
- Spitzer, L. 1962 Physics of Fully Ionized Gases (Interscience, New York).
- Sponholz, H. & Molteni, D. 1994, 271, 233.
- Straumann, N. 1991 in General Relativity and Relativistic Astrophysics (Springer Verlag, Heidelberg).
- Tassoul, J.L. 1978, in Theory of Rotating Stars, (Princeton University Press, New Jersey).
- Taub, A. H. 1978, Ann. Rev. Fluid Mechanics, 10, 301.
- Yang, R. & Kafatos, M. 1995, A & A 295, 238.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Fig. 1a-b Funnel wall (F), centrifugal barrier (CF) and the strong shock surface (S) in a flow which is cold in the pre-shock region and predominantly rotating in the post-shock region. The dashed contours inside the shock are those of thermal pressure plus ram pressure while those outside are those of ram pressure. In regions outside the centrifugal barrier, the shock is stable in accretion while that inside is stable in winds. In (a) energy is constant at a constant von-Zeipel cylindrical surface, while in (b) energy is increasing with latitude to mimic boundary conditions of numerical simulations.

Fig. 2 Classification of the entire parameter space spanned by the specific energy and angular momentum in terms of the number of sonic points and the presence or absence of shocks. See text for details.

Fig. 3 Stable (solid) and unstable (dashed) shock locations in accretion (a_2, a_3) and winds (w_2 and w_3) as a function of the specific energy of the flow for four black holes: $a = 0, l = 3.5$; $a = 0.5, l = 3.0$; $a = 0.95, l = 2.3$; $a = 0.99, l = 2.1$.

Fig. 4 Variation of Mach numbers (left panels) and shear components (right panels) in a prograde (upper panels) and retrograde (lower panels) flow. The shock transition is shown as a vertical arrow. Shear components are not monotonic as in a Newtonian flow, but reverses near the black hole. $\sigma_\phi^r|_{rot}$ is for rotational shear (assuming the flow is predominantly rotating), whereas $\sigma_{\phi p, \phi b}^r$ are for general shear which includes the radial motion.

Fig. 5 Variation of the angular momentum distribution (upper panel) and the heating and cooling rates (lower panel) in presence of ion-viscosity and bremsstrahlung effects respectively. Most of the heat generated by the viscous transonic flow in this case is carried by the flow inwards as the bremsstrahlung is inefficient in radiating it away.

Fig. 6 Funnel walls (Solid curves, marked by F), centrifugal barriers (long dashed curves, marked by CF) and shock surfaces (short dashed curves, marked by S) for the three cases of Fig. 2 for $\mathcal{E} = 1.004$. In each set, the outermost, middle and the innermost curves are for $a = 0, 0.5, 0.95$ respectively.

Fig. 7 Entropy function $\dot{\mathcal{M}}$ is plotted against the inclination angle θ for the three cases as in Fig. 3. The dashed curves are the values for flows passing through the outer sonic surfaces $\dot{\mathcal{M}}_o$, and the solid curves are for flows passing through the inner sonic surfaces $\dot{\mathcal{M}}_i$. Shocks in accretion are possible only when $\dot{\mathcal{M}}_i > \dot{\mathcal{M}}_o$, namely when $\theta_{min,a} < \theta < \theta_{max} = \pi/2$ (equatorial plane). $\theta_{min,a}$ is $\sim 79^\circ, \sim 72^\circ$ and 70° respectively for $a = 0, 0.5, 0.95$ respectively. For $\sim 60^\circ \lesssim \theta < \theta_{min,a}$ shocks may form in winds.















